



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/804,093

03/19/2004

Shigeru Maruyama

043034-0182

7905

22428 7590 07/21/2009

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

JACKSON, JAKIEDA R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/21/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/804,093	Applicant(s) MARUYAMA, SHIGERU	
	Examiner JAKIEDA R. JACKSON	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,9-12 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,9-12 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the Office Action mailed January 28, 2009, applicant submitted an amendment filed on April 14, 2009, in which the applicant amended and requested reconsideration.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant argues that the prior art cited does not teach the newly amended claim reciting wherein the password generator generates a renewed password only in response to a request operation of making a call or taking an incoming call. Applicant's arguments are persuasive, but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 1, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, Applicant's have amended the claims to include wherein the password generator generates a renewed password **only** in response to a request operation of making a call or taking an incoming call.

According to Applicant's specification, Applicant's disclose that the password is renewed each time the device is put to use (page 5, lines 5-7). Although Applicant's specification teaches making and taking a call, it also encompasses other uses of the

device such as phone configurations and receiving emails (column 15, line 17 - column 16, line 7). Applicant's specification does not support that the renewal is based only on the two previously mentioned operations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-4, 9-12 and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pathuel (EP 1176493 A2) in view of McKeeth (USPN 6,411,693) and in further view of Nendell et al. (PGPUB 2002/0133704), hereinafter referenced as Nendell.

Regarding **claims 1, 9 and 14**, Pathuel discloses an unauthorized use prevention apparatus, method and program, hereinafter referenced as an apparatus included in an information processing device, comprising:

a speech feature memory storing identifying speech feature data previously obtained from voice of an authorized user (recording the orally reproduction of the sequence; abstract with column 2, paragraph 0011 and columns 8-9, paragraph 0061-0065);

a password generator for generating a password which is a string of arbitrary characters (generating a sequence of recognizable codes; abstract with column 2, paragraph 0011 and column 3, paragraph 0020 and column 5, paragraph 0034-0036 with column 7, paragraph 0050 and columns 8-9, paragraph 0061-0065);

a password notifying section for notifying a present user of the generated password (provided with a code; column 2, paragraph 0012 and columns 8-9, paragraph 0061-0065);

a speech feature extractor for extracting speech feature data from voice of the present user to produce input speech feature data (prompting the user to orally generate; abstract with column 2, paragraph 0011 and column 5, paragraph 0034-0036 and columns 8-9, paragraph 0061-0065);

a speech feature comparator for comparing the input speech feature data to the identifying speech feature data to produce a speech feature comparison result (performing a speech and speaker analysis; abstract with column 2, paragraph 0011 and column 5, paragraph 0034-0036 and columns 8-9, paragraph 0061-0065);

a password comparator for comparing an input password obtained from the voice of the present user to the generated password to produce a password comparison result (performing a speech and speaker analysis; abstract with column 2, paragraph 0011 and column 5, paragraph 0034-0036 and columns 8-9, paragraph 0061-0065);
and

a controller for determining whether to inhibit the use of the information processing device, depending on the speech feature comparison result and the

Art Unit: 2626

password comparison result (performing a speech and speaker analysis; abstract with column 2, paragraph 0011 and column 3, paragraph 0022 with column 5, paragraph 0034-0036 and columns 8-9, paragraph 0061-0065), but does not specifically teach a telephone dialing operation and a password check only when needed and wherein the password generator generates a renewed password only in response to a request operation of making a call or taking an incoming call.

McKeeth discloses an apparatus comprising:

a database storing a plurality of entries (telephone numbers), each of which includes address information accompanied with password check flag (ignore list; column 7, lines 3-18),

wherein the information processing device is included in a communication device capable of voice communication (telephone service is capable of voice communication ; column 5, lines 40-50); and

wherein, when a first and second telephone dialing request operation occurs (dial a specific telephone number), the controller searches the database for address information related to a telephone number corresponding to the telephone dialing request operation (searches the ignore list) and, when the password check flag accompanying the address information found indicates that password check is needed (not on the ignore list), starts an unauthorized use preventing operation to prevent voice communication to be made to the telephone number corresponding to the telephone dialing request operation (authorization password), column 7, lines 3-18), to prevent unauthorized telephone services to be used.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pathuel's apparatus as described above, to avoid unintended telecommunications (column 1, lines 6-8) and to designate a number of approved telephone to be placed preventing unauthorized use (column 2, lines 51-67), as taught by McKeeth.

Pathuel and view of McKeeth discloses an unauthorized use prevention apparatus, but does not specifically teach wherein the password generator generates a renewed password only in response to a request operation of making a call or taking an incoming call.

Nendell discloses verifying and authenticating identity of participants in an electronic communication device such as a telephone network (paragraph 0038) wherein the password generator generates a renewed password only in response to a request operation of making a call (sending communication) or taking an incoming call (recipient communication; paragraphs 0031, 0034, 0051). Nendell teaches that the codes are completely different/dynamic for every transaction (paragraphs 0033, 0040, 0045-0048, 0055-0059). If the code is correct, in which the identity of the user has been both verified and authenticated, access is granted (paragraph 0069), to layer security features with conventional security feature.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pathuel in view of McKeeth's apparatus as described above, to ensure that only authorized persons gain access (paragraph 0070), as taught by Nendell.

Regarding **claims 2 and 10**, Pathuel discloses an apparatus wherein the generated password is renewed each time the information processing device is put to use (generated immediately after request; column 2, paragraph 0014 and column 3, paragraph 0023).

Regarding **claims 3 and 11**, Pathuel discloses an apparatus wherein the password notifying section comprises a display section for displaying the generated password on screen so as to prompt the present user to sound out the generated password (prompting the user to orally generate; abstract and column 3, paragraph 0020 with column 5, paragraph 0034-0036).

Regarding **claims 4 and 12**, Pathuel discloses an apparatus wherein the password notifying section comprises a speech processor for sounding out the generated password through a speaker so as to prompt the present user to sound out the generated password (prompting the user to orally generate; abstract and column 3, paragraph 0020 with column 5, paragraph 0034-0036).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Tsai (USPN 6,775,557) discloses a telephone method and apparatus.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAKIEDA R. JACKSON whose telephone number is (571)272-7619. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 5:30am-2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jakieda R Jackson/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626
July 17, 2009

/Angela A Armstrong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626